

reliance on promotion prescribe less appropriately,13 and the patients who are exposed more to direct to consumer advertising request more advertised drugs. These requested drugs are usually prescribed, often despite doctors' reservations about treatment choice.14

Both critics and supporters of direct to consumer advertising agree that it is likely to expand drug treatment in healthier populations. This can occur through broader disease definitions, based on physiological measures rather than on clinical events; through promotion of drugs for disease prevention; and through prescription drug use for symptoms previously treated with over the counter remedies or non-drug approaches. An additional effect, observed in the United States at a population level, is substitution of newer for older drugs among those already receiving treatment.

Newer drugs are not necessarily better

Evidence on clinical outcomes is often inadequate when drugs first come on to the market, at times leading to false impressions. COX 2 inhibitors, for example, were widely believed to be safer than other non-steroidal anti-inflammatories when first launched. An assessment of the full experience of serious adverse events in comparative trials suggests the contrary.¹⁵

This type of comparative information does not reach the public in direct to consumer advertisements. In a 10 year analysis of advertising in US magazines, 91% of advertisements omitted information about the likelihood of treatment success and 71% failed to mention any other possible treatments.¹⁶

A powerful cumulative effect

With more than \$2.5bn (£1.8bn; €2.9bn) spent on direct to consumer advertising in the United States last

year, the cumulative message may be stronger than any individual campaign. A market researcher estimated that in late 1999, Americans on average saw nine prescription drug advertisements a day on television. To an unprecedented degree they portrayed the educational message of a pill for every ill-and increasingly an ill for every pill. —Barbara Mintzes

Charles Medawar, Joel Lexchin, Ken Bassett, and Lisa Hayes reviewed a draft of this article.

Competing interests: None declared.

- Kawachi I, Conrad P. Medicalization and the pharmacological treatment of blood pressure. In: Davis P, ed. Contested ground. Public purpose and private interests in the regulation of prescription drugs. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- IMS Health. IMS Health reports pharmaceutical direct-to-consumer advertising investment in US reaches \$1.3 billion in first-half 2000. www.imshealth.com (accessed 20 Jan 2002).
- Researched Medicines Industry Association of New Zealand. DTC advertising can enhance public health. The case for for direct-to-consumer prescription medicine advertising. (Briefing paper, June 2000.) ww.rmianz.co.nz/briefing%20papers/dtc.htm (accessed 27 Mar 2002).
- Thomas L. The medusa and the snail. New York: Bantam Books, 1980.
- Green CJ, Bassett K, Foerster V, Kazanjian A. Bone mineral density testing: does the evidence support its selective use in well women? Vancouver, BC: British Columbia Office of Health Technology Assessment, 1997. (BCOHTA 97:2T.) www.chspr.ubc.ca//bcohta/pdf/bmd.pdf (accessed 10 Feb 2002).
- Pressman A, Forsyth B, Ettinger B, Tosteson AN. Initiation of osteoporosis treatment after bone mineral density testing. Osteoporosis Int 2001:12:337-42.
- Sherwood LM. Important information. Fosamax (alendronate sodium tablets); proper dosing and avoidance of esophageal side effects, (Letter to US physicians, 15 Mar 1996.) MedWatch Safety Summaries—Fosamax. www.fda.gov/medwatch/safety/fosamax.htm (accessed 27 Mar 2002).
- Morais RJ. Mastering the basics-10 steps to DTC. Pharmaceutical Executive 1998:Oct:63-5.
- Reuters Medical News. European "direct-to-consumer" drug information plans may face opposition. www.medscape.com/reuters/prof/2002/01/ 01.11/20020110rglt009.html (accessed 18 Jan 2002).
- 10 Pignone M, Phillips C, Mulrow C. Use of lipid lowering drugs for primary prevention of coronary heart disease: meta-analysis of randomised trials. BMJ 2000;321:983-6.
- 11 Pfizer and Canadian Lipid Nurses' Network. Which would you rather have, a cholesterol test or a final exam? Chatelaine 2001:74(9):74-5. (Advertisement for cholesterol testing.)
- 12 World Health Organization. Clinical pharmacological evaluation in drug control. Copenhagen: WHO, 1993. (EUR/ICP/DSE 173.)
- 13 Wazana A. Physicians and the pharmaceutical industry. Is a gift ever just a
- gift? JAMA 2000;283:373-80.

 14 Mintzes B, Barer ML, Kravitz RL, Kazanjian A, Bassett K, Lexchin J, et al. Influence of direct to consumer pharmaceutical advertising and patients' requests on prescribing decisions: two site cross sectional survey. BMJ 2002;324:278-9.
- 15 Therapeutics Initiative. Cox-2 inhibitors update: do journal publications tell the full story? Therapeutics Letter 2001;43. www.ti.ubc.ca/PDF/43.pdf (accessed 27 Mar 2002).
- 16 Bell RA, Wilkes MS, Kravitz RL. The educational value of consumertargeted prescription drug print advertising. J Fam Pract 2000;49:1092-8.

Endpiece

Disability and cure

Indeed, through the invention of disability status, culture now regulates pain in ways that may well increase, prolong, or even create it. As agents of the state, doctors are required not only to treat pain but also to judge whether it merits compensation-a dual role that can easily turn countertherapeutic. How do you cure a patient you have already certified as disabled?

> David B Morris. Illness and culture in the postmodern age. Berkeley CA, London: University of California Press, 1998

Submitted by Iona Heath. general practitioner, London